

Medicaid, Food Stamps, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), General Assistance, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or the National School Free Lunch program. 47 C.F.R. §54.409(a); *In the Matter of the Implementation of New Lifeline Service Program Eligibility Guidelines and Requirements*, KCC Docket No. 05-GIMT-1039-GIT, *Order Opening Docket and Establishing New Lifeline Service Program Eligibility Requirements and Guidelines* (May 19, 2005).<sup>2</sup> A resident of federally-recognized Tribal lands will be eligible for enhanced Lifeline and/or Link Up assistance if the applicant satisfies any of the forgoing criteria or participates in any of the following additional programs: Bureau of Indian Affairs General Assistance, tribally administered TANF or Head Start (based on income qualifying standards). 47 C.F.R. § 54.409(b).

## 2. Lifeline

The federal Lifeline program reimburses an ETC for providing qualified, low-income consumers a monthly discount off the cost of the carrier's lowest-cost residential rate plan. As set forth in the FCC's universal service rules, Lifeline is defined as "a retail local service offering: (1) [t]hat is available only to qualifying low-income consumers; (2) [f]or which qualifying low-income consumers pay reduced charges as a result of application of the Lifeline support amount described in [47 C.F.R. §] 54.403." 47 C.F.R. § 54.401(a) (emphasis added).

FCC Rule 54.403 defines both the amount of federal Lifeline support available and the limitations on the application of such support. Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 54.403, federal Lifeline

---

<sup>2</sup> In certain instances, the FCC's universal service regulations require a federal ETC to comply with State Lifeline/Link Up rules. These are limited to: State eligibility criteria (47 C.F.R. §§ 54.409(a) and 54.415(a)); State income certification procedures (47 C.F.R. § 54.410(a)(1)); State procedure to verify continued eligibility (47 C.F.R. § 54.410(c)(1)); State procedures for resolving disputes concerning eligibility and the termination of Lifeline assistance due to ineligibility (47 C.F.R. § 54.405(c)-(d)); and State recordkeeping requirements (47 C.F.R. § 54.417(a)).

In adopting the regulations discussed above, the FCC clarified that a federal ETC must apply the federal Lifeline support it receives to the carrier's lowest generally available residential rate for the Supported Services:

These rules require that carriers offer qualified low-income consumers the services that must be included within Lifeline service, as discussed more fully below, including toll-limitation service. ILECs providing Lifeline service will be required to waive Lifeline customers' federal SLCs and, conditioned on state approval, to pass through to Lifeline consumers an additional \$1.75 in federal support. ILECs will then receive a corresponding amount of support from the new support mechanisms. Other eligible telecommunications carriers will receive, for each qualifying low income consumer served, support equal to the federal SLC cap for primary residential and single-line business connections, plus \$1.75 in additional federal support conditioned on state approval. The federal support amount must be passed through to the consumer in its entirety. In addition, all carriers providing Lifeline service will be reimbursed from the new universal service support mechanisms for their incremental cost of providing toll-limitation services to Lifeline customers who elect to receive them. The remaining services included in Lifeline must be provided to qualifying low-income consumers at the carrier's lowest tariffed (or otherwise generally available) rate for those services, or at the state's mandated Lifeline rate, if the state mandates such a rate for low-income consumers.

*Universal Service Order*, ¶ 368 (emphasis added).

Likewise, in formulating its initial universal service recommendations to the FCC in 1996, the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (the "Joint Board") determined that the "Lifeline rate" to be made available to qualified, low-income consumers shall be "the carrier's lowest comparable non-Lifeline rate reduced by at least the \$5.25 [now \$8.25] amount of federal support." *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket 96-45, *Recommended Decision*, FCC 96J-3, 12 FCC Rcd. 87, 61 FR 63778, ¶ 424 (rel. Nov. 8, 1996) ("Joint Board Recommended Decision").

### 3. Link Up

The federal Link Up program reimburses ETCs for providing discounted service activation or installation charges to qualified, low-income consumers. Consumers qualifying for

Link Up assistance are eligible to save up to 50% of the first \$60 of the ETC's customary service activation or installation charges (*i.e.*, the subscriber will receive a 50% discount or \$30.00, whichever is less). Qualified, low-income consumers residing on federally-recognized Tribal lands may receive an additional \$70 to defray 100% of the service activation or installation charges between \$60 and \$130. Eligible consumers may also establish an interest-free 12-month deferred payment plan for the remaining activation or installation charges of up to \$200.

**D. Sprint's Lifeline Service Offering**

In Kansas, Sprint's Lifeline service offering is based on the Company's lowest cost \$29.99 base rate plan, which includes 200 Anytime Minutes and unlimited Night and Weekend Minutes. The calling area for Sprint's Lifeline service offering is national, so Lifeline customers may make outgoing long distance calls without incurring an additional charge. In addition to the FCC-defined Supported Services, Sprint's Lifeline service offering also includes the following enhanced services at no charge to the customer: voice mail, call waiting, caller ID, numeric paging and three-way calling. After applying the total \$13.50<sup>5</sup> federal Lifeline discount, Sprint customers pay only \$16.49 per month for Lifeline service.

**E. The Kansas Lifeline Rule**

In October 2005, the KCC commenced an administrative rulemaking proceeding (Docket No. 06-GIMT-446-GIT) to review the adoption of certain additional regulations and

---

<sup>5</sup> To enable Lifeline customers in Kansas to receive the full \$13.50 discount, Sprint voluntarily reduces its rate by \$3.50. These "carrier-matching funds" ensure that the Lifeline subscriber will receive \$1.75 in federal Tier 3 matching support. See 47 C.F.R. § 54.409(c) ("[Q]ualifying low-income consumer shall also qualify for Tier-Three Lifeline support, if the carrier offering the Lifeline service is not subject to the regulation of the state and provides carrier-matching funds . . .")

requirements applicable to carriers designated as federal ETCs in Kansas. On October 2, 2006, the KCC released an Order<sup>6</sup> adopting the following requirement:

ETCs are required to allow Lifeline customers to choose a calling plan and to apply the Lifeline discount to the plan selected by the customer. Any ETC that does not allow customer selection at this time must do so within 180 days [*i.e.*, by March 31, 2007] of the date of this Order.

In other words, the KCC directed all ETCs to apply the federal Lifeline discounts to any calling plan selected by the consumer, rather than a carrier's lowest cost residential rate plan as expressly required by 47 C.F.R. § 54.403(b).

### III. ARGUMENT

The Kansas Lifeline Rule violates federal law and must be enjoined for the following three reasons:

1. The Kansas Lifeline Rule is inconsistent and cannot be reconciled with the FCC's universal service rules in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 254(f);
2. Compliance with the Kansas Lifeline Rule would require a federal ETC to inappropriately apply federal low-income universal support to reduce the cost of any rate plan selected by the consumer, rather than the carrier's lowest cost residential rate plan as expressly required by 47 C.F.R. § 54.403(b); and
3. Compliance with the Kansas Lifeline Rule would require Sprint to provide an equivalent monthly Lifeline service discount (*i.e.*, \$13.50) on any rate plan without the ability to recover the discount from the federal universal service support fund. As a result, the Rule would unlawfully regulate Sprint's rates in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3)(A).

---

<sup>6</sup> Copies of the Order and the subsequent Order denying motions for reconsideration, are attached as exhibits 1 and 2.

**A. Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary Injunction Standard**

The Court is vested with broad discretion in determining whether preliminary injunctive relief should be granted. *Kiowa Indian Tribe of Oklahoma v. Hoover*, 150 F.3d 1163, 1171 (10th Cir. 1998). Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, the Court may issue a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction to maintain the *status quo* pending a final determination on the merits. *Tri-State Generation & Transmission Ass'n, Inc. v. Shoshone River Power, Inc.*, 805 F.2d 351, 355 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986). A party seeking preliminary injunctive relief must generally demonstrate the following: (1) irreparable harm unless the injunction issues; (2) the threatened injury to the moving party outweighs any damage to the opposing party; (3) the injunction, if issued, will not be adverse to the public interest; and (4) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits. See *Tri-State*, 805 F.2d at 355; *Fed. Lands Legal Consortium ex rel. Robart Estate v. United States*, 195 F.3d 1190, 1194 (10th Cir. 1999); *SCFC ILC, Inc. v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 936 F.2d 1096, 1098 (10th Cir. 1991). If the moving party satisfies the first three elements, the standard for meeting the fourth requirement, likelihood of success on the merits, generally becomes more lenient and the moving party "need only show that the issues are so serious, substantial, difficult, and doubtful as to make them fair ground for litigation." *Keirnan v. Utah Transit Auth.*, 339 F.3d 1217, 1221 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003); *Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska v. Stovall*, 216 F.Supp.2d 1226, 1231 (D. Kan. 2002), *aff'd*, 341 F.3d 1202.

**B. Each Of The Criteria Warranting Preliminary Injunctive Relief Is Decisively Satisfied In This Case**

**1. Sprint Will Suffer Irreparable Harm If Enforcement Of The Kansas Lifeline Rule Is Not Enjoined**

Sprint will suffer irreparable harm if the Kansas Lifeline Rule is enforced. As set forth above, compliance with the Kansas Lifeline Rule would require Sprint to inappropriately apply federal low-income universal support to reduce the cost of any calling plan selected by a Lifeline

customer, rather than Sprint's lowest cost generally available residential rate plan as required by 47 C.F.R. § 54.403(b). FCC Rule 54.403(b) expressly requires "other" ETCs (meaning a competitive ETC, like Sprint, that does not include the SLC charge as a component of its rate) to only apply federal Lifeline support to the carrier's lowest cost residential rate plan that includes the essential Supported Services:

Other eligible telecommunications carriers shall apply the Tier-One federal Lifeline support amount, plus any additional support amount, to reduce their lowest tariffed (or otherwise generally available) residential rate for the services enumerated in Sec. 54.101(a)(1) through (a)(9), and charge Lifeline consumers the resulting amount.

47 C.F.R. § 54.403(b) (emphasis added). "Shall," in this case, is mandatory. *United States v. Myers*, 106 F.3d 936, 941 (10th Cir. 1997) ("It is a basic canon of statutory construction that use of the word 'shall' indicates mandatory intent."), *cert. denied*, 117 S.Ct. 2446 (1997).

FCC Rule 54.403(b) is unambiguous, but even if it were, the FCC clearly stated its intention to only apply the Lifeline discount to an ETC's lowest cost residential rate plan:

The remaining services [*i.e.*, the Supported Services other than Toll Limitation] included in Lifeline must be provided to qualifying low-income consumers at the carrier's lowest tariffed (or otherwise generally available) rate for those services, or at the state's mandated Lifeline rate, if the state mandates such a rate for low-income consumers.

*Universal Service Order*, ¶ 368 (emphasis added). Indeed, in so doing, the FCC relied on the Joint Board recommendation that the "Lifeline rate" must be "the carrier's lowest comparable non-Lifeline rate reduced by at least the \$5.25 [now \$8.25] amount of federal support." *Joint Board Recommended Decision*, ¶ 424 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, because the Kansas Lifeline Rule would improperly require Sprint to apply federal Lifeline support to reduce the cost of any calling plan, rather than Sprint's lowest cost generally available residential rate plan, Sprint would be required to violate 47 C.F.R.

§ 54.403(b) to comply with the new State law requirement. Sprint cannot be forced to choose between compliance with State or federal law without suffering irreparable harm.

**2. The Balance Of Harms Clearly Favors Sprint**

For similar reasons, the balance of harms clearly favors Sprint. If enforcement of the Kansas Lifeline Rule is not enjoined, Sprint will be required to violate federal law in order to comply with the State law requirement. If enforcement of the Kansas Lifeline Rule is enjoined, however, it would simply maintain the *status quo*. Sprint will still be able to provide eligible consumers federal Lifeline assistance, and those customers will still be able to subscribe to Sprint's Lifeline service offering pending the Court's final decision on the merits.

**3. Injunctive Relief Will Promote, Not Harm, The Public Interest**

Enjoining the enforcement of the Kansas Lifeline Rule will also promote the public interest. If the Kansas Lifeline Rule is not enjoined pending a final decision of this Court, Lifeline customers that subscribe to a non-compliant rate plan may ultimately be disqualified from receiving federal Lifeline assistance for that plan. At the very least, this result would create unnecessary consumer confusion or, worse, could result in the mandatory disgorgement and restitution of program benefits.

**4. Sprint Will Undoubtedly Prevail**

Enforcement of the Kansas Lifeline Rule should also be enjoined because Sprint is likely to prevail on the merits. Because the Kansas Lifeline Rule cannot be reconciled with 47 C.F.R. § 54.403(b), the KCC had no authority to adopt the requirement under federal law. As discussed above, a State commission's authority to adopt additional universal service requirements is circumscribed by 47 U.S.C. § 254(f), which prohibits the adoption of any State requirement that is inconsistent with the FCC's universal service rules. 47 U.S.C. § 254(f) ("A State may adopt regulations not inconsistent with the [FCC's] rules to preserve and advance universal service.")

(emphasis added). The limited authority delegated under section 254(f) is permissive. If a State commission adopts a regulation that is consistent with the FCC's rules, it may be enforced. However, if the State requirement is inconsistent with the FCC's rules – like the Kansas Lifeline Rule in this case – the State requirement is preempted and unenforceable under federal law.

Sprint is also likely to prevail because the Kansas Lifeline Rule would unlawfully regulate its rates in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3)(A). Compliance with the Kansas Lifeline Rule would require Sprint to provide an equivalent monthly service discount (*i.e.*, \$13.50) to qualified, low-income consumers that subscribe to any of its service offerings, not just Sprint's lowest cost Lifeline service offering. Yet, FCC Rule 54.403(b) would prohibit Sprint from receiving federal Lifeline universal service support to reimburse the Company for providing such discounts. In other words, the Kansas Lifeline Rule is an unfunded mandate that will require Sprint to discount its rates for a particular class of end-users without compensation. This is rate regulation in its purest form.

As a CMRS provider, Sprint's rates are specifically exempt from State regulation. Section 332(c)(3)(A) of the Act prohibits any State action which would effectively regulate the rates charged by a CMRS provider:

[N]o State or local government shall have any authority to regulate the entry of or the rates charged by any commercial mobile service or any private mobile service, except that this paragraph shall not prohibit a State from regulating the other terms and conditions of commercial mobile services . . . .

47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3)(A) (emphasis added). Although a State may petition the FCC, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 20.13, for an exemption from section 332(c)(3)(A), the KCC has never done so. The KCC's inaction is fatal. *See WWC Holding Co. v. Sopkin*, 420 F.Supp.2d 1186, 1193-94 (D. Colo. 2006), *appeal pending* (A CMRS provider's status as a federal ETC did not authorize



the State regulatory commission to regulate the carrier's rates. The State commission must first petition the FCC for regulatory authority under 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3)(A) and 47 C.F.R. § 20.13).

Accordingly, because the KCC had no authority to adopt the Kansas Lifeline Rule, and because the Rule would effectively regulate Sprint's rates in violation of section 332(c)(3)(A), enforcement of the Rule should be enjoined as Sprint is likely to prevail on the merits.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, the Court should preliminarily enjoin the enforcement of the Kansas Lifeline Rule pending a determination on the merits concerning its inconsistency with and violation of federal law.

Dated: March 23, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

/s/ Mark D. Hinderks

Mark D. Hinderks (KS 11293)  
12 Corporate Woods  
10975 Benson, Suite 550  
Overland Park, Kansas 66210-2008  
Telephone: (913) 344-6706  
Facsimile: (913) 344-6794  
mhinderks@stinson.com

BRIGGS AND MORGAN, P.A.  
Matthew A. Slaven (MN 288226)  
2200 IDS Center  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2157  
Telephone: (612) 977-8400  
Facsimile: (612) 977-8650  
mslaven@briggs.com

*ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF  
SPRINT SPECTRUM, L.P.*

**ATTACHMENT 8**

---

**From:** KSD\_CMECF@ksd.uscourts.gov [mailto:KSD\_CMECF@ksd.uscourts.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 08, 2007 2:41 PM  
**To:** KSD\_CMECF\_Security@ksd.uscourts.gov  
**Subject:** Activity in Case 2:07-cv-02130-KHV-JPO Sprint Spectrum, L.P. v. Moline et al Order

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please **DO NOT RESPOND** to this e-mail because the mail box is **unattended**.  
**\*\*\*NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS\*\*\*** You may view the filed documents once without charge. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.

**U.S. District Court**

**District of Kansas**

**Notice of Electronic Filing**

The following transaction was entered on 5/8/2007 at 2:40 PM CDT and filed on 5/8/2007

**Case Name:** Sprint Spectrum, L.P. v. Moline et al

**Case Number:** 2:07-cv-2130

**Filer:**

**WARNING: CASE CLOSED on 05/08/2007**

**Document Number:** 31(No document attached)

**Docket Text:**

ORDER. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation [29], the Court refers this matter to the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") under the primary jurisdiction doctrine. All matters in the case are hereby stayed pending a decision by the FCC. In light of this ruling, defendants' motion to dismiss [#25] and defendants' motion for leave [27] are hereby overruled without prejudice. The Clerk is directed to close the case administratively. Signed by Judge Kathryn H. Vratil on 5/8/07.(This is a TEXT ENTRY ONLY. There is no.pdf document associated with this entry.)(ls)

**2:07-cv-2130 Notice has been electronically mailed to:**

Mark D. Hinderks mhinderks@stinson.com

Eva Powers e.powers@kcc.state.ks.us

W. Bret Lawson b.lawson@kcc.state.ks.us

Matthew A Slaven mslaven@briggs.com

**2:07-cv-2130 Notice has been delivered by other means to:**